

# **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS**

Below is an index of comments received from interested members of the public and governmental agencies that contained questions on staff's review of the East Altamont Energy Center (EAEC) Application for Certification or other comments that require some form of response. A few of the questions or comments are answered in this chapter, but most are addressed in the applicable technical section/chapter cross-referenced below. Responses appearing in separate chapters are included under the heading "Response to Public and Agency Comments." Following the index is a copy of each comment.

Also included are responses to comments received during the California Energy Commission / Western Area Power Administration joint scoping meeting, held November 14, 2001.

## **AGENCY COMMENTS ON THE PSA**

---

### **ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

On August 15 and October 4, 2001, staff received letters from the Alameda County Community Development Agency that provided comments from various County departments regarding the proposed EAEC. These letters contained comments and recommended conditions for certification that are addressed in the following sections of this document:

LAND USE

VISUAL RESOURCES

WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

The Community Development Agency, in conjunction with the County's department of Environmental Health Services, later submitted a letter on December 17, 2001, with comments on the noise element of the PSA. These comments are addressed in NOISE AND VIBRATION.

### **ALAMEDA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT**

On January 30, 2002, the Alameda County Fire Department wrote a letter to staff regarding Alameda County's jurisdiction over the site where the EAEC is proposed to be located. These comments are addressed in WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION.

### **ALAMEDA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY**

The Alameda County Public Works Agency submitted a letter to staff on May 8, 2002, with concerns and suggested conditions of certification concerning roadways. These comments are addressed in the TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION.

## **BYRON BETHANY IRRIGATION DISTRICT (BBID)**

On October 8 and October 30, 2001, staff received letters from Byron Bethany Irrigation District expressing numerous concerns regarding staff's analysis of water rights issues and the feasibility of alternative sources of recycled water for the EAEC. The specific comments are addressed in SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES.

## **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH**

The Department of Industrial Relations submitted a letter to staff on September 6, 2001, with comments about safety and health programs for the proposed EAEC. These comments are addressed in the WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION.

## **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

On May 14, 2001, the Department of Water Resources provided comments regarding the potential effects of increased fault currents from the EAEC on their facilities' electrical systems and equipment. These comments are addressed in TRANSMISSION SYSTEM ENGINEERING.

## **CITY OF TRACY FIRE DEPARTMENT**

The City of Tracy Fire Department submitted comments to the Alameda County Fire Department with a carbon copy to staff, on June 10, 2002, with concerns regarding their mutual aid agreement with Alameda County. Staff has addressed these concerns as part of their analysis of WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION.

## **CITY OF TRACY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

On December 20, 2001, the City of Tracy Public Works Department submitted comments on the PSA regarding the availability of recycled water from their wastewater treatment plant. These comments are addressed in SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES.

## **CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT**

On January 18, 2002, the Contra Costa Water District provided comments on the Preliminary Staff Assessment / Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PSA/PEA) concerning water impacts that are addressed in the SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES chapter of this document.

## **DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL**

The Department of Toxic Substances Control submitted comments dated October 16, 2001 regarding the Application for Certification in relation to the Site Mitigation Plan. These comments are addressed in the WASTE section of this document.

## **EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT**

On January 14, 2002, the East Bay Regional Park District submitted comments on the Preliminary Staff Assessment expressing concerns that the project not interfere with the District's Master Plan to develop future trails in the vicinity of the proposed power plant. These comments are addressed in LAND USE.

## **MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT (MID)**

MID submitted comments to staff regarding the EAEC project interconnection to the Tracy-Westley 230 kV line (the line owned by MID and Turlock Irrigation District and the

electrical grid operated by the Western Area Power Administration). MID's concerns are addressed in TRANSMISSION SYSTEM ENGINEERING.

## **MOUNTAIN HOUSE COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT**

On December 14, 2001, the Mountain House Community Services District submitted comments regarding fire protection for the EAEC. These comments are addressed in WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION.

## **SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Dario Marengo, Chairman of the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, sent a letter to Chairman Keese on June 27, 2001 to notify the Energy Commission of a resolution adopted June 26, 2001 opposing the EAEC. The resolution cites concerns regarding air pollution, fumes and potential transportation hazards arising from the plant's proposed use of ammonia, an evacuation plan, and the plant's use of fresh water. A corrected copy of the resolution was submitted in a letter dated July 11, 2001. Staff met with Supervisor Bedford on May 9, 2002 to further explore these concerns. These comments are addressed in AIR QUALITY, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, and SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES.

## **SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

San Joaquin County Community Development Department submitted comments on the EAEC on August 1, 2001. Due to the project's proximity to Mountain House, and San Joaquin County in general, the Community Development Department has concerns regarding construction and project impacts relative to air quality, noise, and traffic. The Department asked that the Energy Commission's assessment address risks associated with ammonia as well as noise generated by construction, normal operations, and traffic. Staff believes that we have adequately addressed these topics in AIR QUALITY, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, and NOISE. Because the concerns are general in nature, however, there is no specific response given in these chapters.

## **SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

On March 14, 2002, the San Joaquin County Department of Public Works provided comments on the PSA/PEA regarding potential impacts to roadways. These comments are addressed in TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION.

## **TOWN OF DISCOVERY BAY**

The General Manager of the Town of Discovery Bay wrote a letter to staff on November 14, 2001 providing background information on their wastewater treatment plant expansion plans, and proposing to serve recycled water to the East Altamont Energy Center. These comments are addressed in SOIL & WATER RESOURCES.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS (NON-INTERVENORS)**

---

### **MATT SULLIVAN**

**MS-1** *My name is Matt Sullivan, and I am a resident of Pleasanton, California. I am also a member of the Pleasanton Planning Commission, as well as the community Energy Advisory Group appointed by the City Council. I have*

*reviewed the Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) for the East Altamont Energy Center proposed by Calpine, and offer the following comments and questions.*

*Based on my review of the PSA, there appears to be several serious issues and impacts from the building of this plant. The PSA has pointed out potential problems with air quality, biological resources, soil and water resources, land use, and the transmission system. However, as the CEC has pointed out, the Applicant has not submitted the required information nor has taken the necessary steps to fully evaluate these impacts. How can the public weigh in if all the information has not been provided? I would request that there be an updated PSA and another round of public hearings before the CEC prepares the Final Staff Assessment.*

Response: Because of this concern, staff held several workshops in between the PSA and the FSA, to allow members of the public to follow these issues as they evolved. After the FSA is released there will be additional opportunities for public comment at hearings that will be held in October of this year.

Other specific items and questions I would like to raise are as follows:

**MS-2** *With this plant the state is again trying to solve the “energy crises” by building large central plants and transmitting power over long distances to reach the end user. This results in severe environmental problems in terms of land use, air quality and water impacts, as well as the impacts caused by building/expanding transmission lines – not too mention the electrical loses from the transmission lines. We need a new model that is based on Distributed Generation, Renewable Energy and Demand Side Management to meet our energy needs.*

Response: The Energy Commission in fact has programs to promote research and development, or address commercialization barriers, for distributed generation and renewable energy technologies, as well as programs to promote Demand Side Management. However, the Energy Commission is also required to analyze power plant proposals on their face. We compare the project to other technologies in our alternatives analysis, but we cannot redefine the project or require the developer to change their project.

**MS-3** *This plant will use 4,600 acre-feet of water per year. In a state like California, this is an unconscionable use of water when viable alternatives exist.  
(See SOIL & WATER RESOURCES)*

**MS-4** *How will the crystallized brine from the water treatment plant be disposed of? How will cooling tower blowdown and other wastewater streams be dealt with?  
(See SOIL & WATER RESOURCES)*

**MS-5** *The cost estimate for this plant is \$500 million. Calpine has been experiencing financial problems of late. Is there any requirement for a bond from the developer to allow the plant to be completed (or dismantled) in case Calpine goes bankrupt or pulls out halfway through construction?*

Response: You raise a good point, but as of yet we do not have any requirements for applicants to be bonded. We do, however, require closure plans as a condition of certification.

**MS-6** *The PSA has pointed out that Calpine is not proposing BACT air emissions controls for the plant. Again, unconscionable in an area with severe air quality problems to begin with. In addition to air pollution impacts on the San Joaquin Valley, this will add to the air pollution problems in the downwind Sierra Nevada Mountain region.  
(See AIR QUALITY)*

**MS-7** *The fact that the flawed deregulation bill of 1998, AB1890, precludes the consideration of new plant need by the Energy Commission in the approval process is absurd. This first thing we need in developing a sane energy policy for California is to determine real needs and how they best can be addressed.*

Response: You have expressed a valid concern, but this would require a change in legislation, which is beyond the scope of staff's analysis.

**MS-8** *I believe that the evaluation of Project Alternatives performed in the PSA was superficial and totally inadequate. No data, analysis or examples were presented to justify the conclusions, especially in regard to Distributed Resources or Demand Side Management. This is typical of a report that seems to want to justify the building of a plant at all costs, and was similar to the sham of an evaluation that PG&E performed for the Tri-Valley Transmission Upgrade project. I will offer just a few examples of Demand-Side Management strategies that are being taken now locally can reduce the need for this project:*

- 1. San Francisco just passed a \$100 million revenue bond to finance the implementation of solar PV and wind generation installations, and comprehensive energy-efficiency measures. San Francisco estimates that they can provide 40 megawatts of new renewable power from this program*
- 2. The City of Pleasanton has established an Energy Advisory Group, made of residents, business, and industry representatives, whose goal is to develop a comprehensive, sustainable energy strategy for the City. The group has already identified distributed generation, renewable energy and demand-side strategies that are expected to greatly reduce electric demand in the City, as well as reduced reliance of grid power.*
- 3. For the past year and a half, Pleasanton has included comprehensive "Greenbuilding" and solar PV conditions in all new commercial and residential development approvals. This will further reduce the energy demand of the City and the need for grid-supplied power.*
- 4. The City of Dublin is exploring options to build a locally owned and controlled 50MW power plant in the city, that would reinforce the grid and reduce the need for large, remote power plants such as the EAEC.*

5. *The Cities of Walnut Creek, Brentwood and San Ramon are preparing energy plans and strategies to implement a wide range of demand-side measures to save energy – which will again reduce the need for plants like the EAEC.*

*These are just a few local examples of actions that are being taken locally that are viable alternatives – or at the very minimum – would reduce the need for large central plants such as the EAEC. The PSA has totally failed in its evaluation of such alternatives, especially if they are examined in the context of their potential positive impact of grid load reduction.*

*The PSA also states that renewable alternatives are not cost competitive with the EAEC. However, the total costs – including the environmental and social costs – are not examined in the analysis. Who will pay for the environmental impacts and increased health care costs that result from the plant? The taxpayers. Who will pay for the loss of property value of the adjacent neighbors, including those in the future Mountain House community? The property owners. Who will pay the increased food costs that result from diminishing prime farmland? The consumers. Who will pay the costs to upgrade the transmission and distribution systems that will be required to get this power to the end users? The ratepayers. These costs are not included in the analysis.*

*Developers – and generally the public agencies that approach such projects - call these costs “externals” and dismiss them from the analysis and comparison with other alternatives. This approach does not provide a fair comparison of alternatives.*

*Finally, the biggest cost to consumers will come from increasing the monopoly that a few large power providers have on the market. We saw this last year with the “gaming” of the supply market, and we are bound to see it again unless fundamental change in energy generation, transmission and use occur.*

Response: The analysis of alternatives in the PSA (and in this FSA) is consistent with the requirements of CEQA, which does not require that alternatives be evaluated at the same level of detail as the proposed project. Conservation and Demand Side Management (DSM) are not evaluated as alternatives to the proposed project because the efforts to implement these programs are ongoing, and will continue regardless of whether this project is approved. Additionally, staff is prohibited from considering these measures as alternatives to a proposed project by Public Resources Code 25305(c).

Staff agrees that the types of local programs described in the comment are essential components of California's approach to providing an adequate energy supply. However, it remains to be seen whether the specific power plants mentioned (particularly the 50 MW power plant in Dublin and distributed generation in Pleasanton) will actually be implemented. Several 50 MW peaker plants were proposed in the Pleasanton and Livermore areas

in 2000-2001, and all met with strong citizen opposition, resulting in the applicants being forced to withdraw their applications.

The City and County of San Francisco are more aggressively addressing their power needs, as acknowledged in the comment. The first San Francisco solar project to be implemented under the revenue bond program would provide 300-500 kilowatts of power for about \$700,000 (consistent with the expectation contained in your letter that up to 40 MW could be generated under the \$100 million bond issue, assuming that appropriate locations are found for the solar installations). Staff is not aware of similar projects underway in Alameda County, however.

Regarding the concerns about public health issues and loss of prime farmland, these potential impacts have been addressed in this FSA (see sections on PUBLIC HEALTH and LAND USE), and mitigation is recommended to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

## **SUSAN M. SARVEY**

**SMS-1** *I was on the GWF mitigation committee. We were able to get what our community needed. The pollution Control Board just rolled over without a look back for our health. Read our mitigation for yourself and see how much more relevant it was for our community and valley air. In the GWF case it came to light that my fire truck spends 30% of its response time in Alameda County and there is no fire protection for my home and the GWF Plant. This plant will only add more responsibility to our overburdened fire department and it will add more fire risk. We all know that fire is terrible for air quality. Safeway had to provide a fire truck when they came to Tracy and EAEC should have to do the same so my air, public health and safety are not put at greater risk. Calpine professes to have good intentions but at every turn they try to take the cheap way out and suppress public input and participation. Ask GWF (Doug Wheeler) this will not work in Tracy. We care about our health and safety and we are ready to do whatever it takes to protect it.*

(See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION)

## **EDDIE GANDARILLA**

**EG-2** *Calpine will pollute our local area while the San Joaquin Valley Air District will send our mitigation money on Bakersfield. They already screwed us with the Tracy Peaker Plant. How many of these plants are we going to get? Offsetting their pollution with credits from industries shut down 10 years ago doesn't help no matter where the ERC's are located. The SJVAPCD is selling out Tracy once again.*

(See AIR QUALITY)

## **EMMA I. HALL**

**EIH-1** *I am offended that Calpine has reneged on their promise to mitigate the impact of their plant on the citizens of Tracy. They now propose to give the funds to the Pollution Control District. I do not trust the Pollution Control District to use the funds for our protection.*

*Their actions on the GWF project proves my theory. Every indication from their efforts on this project show their poor judgment.*

Response: Your comment has been noted. Please see AIR QUALITY for a response to your concerns.

## **PAUL SUNDBERG**

**PS-1** *It's ironic that the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District is asking for money to mitigate EAEC Pollution because the emission reduction credits are up to 60 miles away from the plant site. The ERC's provided by the SJVAPCD to mitigate the Tracy Peaker Plants emissions were predominately 200 miles away. The San Joaquin Pollution District will sell out the citizens of Tracy out just like they did in the Tracy Peaker Plant. They will probably spend the \$965,000 to fix up their office in Fresno. I attended the EAEC Workshop in Tracy and found the District representative to be very arrogant. Didn't he realize that without the CEC staff the district would receive no mitigation. The only local mitigation we got from GWF was through our own citizens negotiating. Calpine is using the Pollution Control District to ruin any real local air quality mitigation that the CEC might force them to provide. They are just trying to avoid their obligation to offset their local emissions in the Tracy area. Deny them their license.*

(See AIR QUALITY)

## **IRENE K. SUNDBERG**

**IKS-1** *This is just mind provoking that this community should have to deal with the air pollution from the bay area and not have been included in mitigation. Our fire truck is gone 30% of the time to the Altamont Hills to assist on fires from Alameda County because Tracy is closer and can usually get there faster.*

*Tracy should be at the table for mitigation as they formed a citizens group to mitigate with GWF, they should also mitigate East Altamont.*

*The acceptable mitigation would be a fire truck and station for all the power companies to share the cost in, as we wouldn't need this if we had no power companies breathing down our necks.*

*Tracy should have the right to mitigate these issues as we did with GWF. We want to mitigate these issues!*

(See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION)



## **PAULA R. BUENAVISTA**

- PRB-1** *I respectfully request that the California Energy Commission require the Calpine Company (East Altamont project) to mitigate all of its air quality credits in Tracy. Allowing this company to clean up other areas of the San Joaquin Valley will do absolutely nothing to clean the air in our local Tracy. Ground level ozone is becoming an increasing health hazard that our community is having to endure.*
- Please enforce the strictest mitigation possible to this business. It is my request that in our current grade of poor air quality, labeled “extreme” by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, that this project be denied.*
- (See AIR QUALITY)

## **CYNTHIA B. JOHNSON**

- CBJ-1** *There is an article attached to this public comment form. It is an article regarding Asthma. Also “How smog chokes the valley.”*
- (See AIR QUALITY)

## **ANN K. JOHNSON**

- AKJ-1** *There is an article attached to this public comment form. It is an article entitled “...leaves locals gasping for air.” (The first part of the title is cut off.)*
- (See AIR QUALITY)

## **JON S. SNYDER**

- JSS-1** *There is an article attached to this public comment form. It is an article entitled “Breathless.”*
- (See AIR QUALITY)

## **CAROLE DOMINGUEZ**

- CD-1** *We need negotiation on our fire service needs. Our trucks respond to Altamont fires leaving our city at risk and without adequate coverage.*
- (See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION)

## **BETHANY G. HOOPER**

- BGH-1** *Tracy needs a fully equipped fire station and mitigation for air quality from East Altamont.*
- The deaf should be included in public notification process of problems with these 3 plants coming on line in our area. Using a public warning system for the deaf and full website alert would allow the hearing impaired to be notified also.*

(See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)

## **JAMES M. HOOPER**

**JMH-1** *We want a fully equipped fire station that services the 3 electrical plants only. Tracy needs mitigation right with EAEC. I want TTY's in public services areas so the hearing impaired can be notified of emergencies.*

(See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION)

## **CATHERINE H. HARITON**

**CHH-1** Fire protection needed. Another fire station is a necessity.

(See WORKER SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION)

## **GARY & DOLORES KUHN**

**G&DK-1** *In addition to your concerns, we are deeply disturbed about the pollution at our residence (0.4 miles from project) and even more disturbed that Calpine would place this project within 0.9 miles from a school—especially since the medical response time is a good 35 to 50 minutes, depending on the time of day and freeway gridlock. If there was any disaster within the plant, such as ammonia leaks, etc., what type of warning would the residents and school be given? Should the students and residents have emergency shelters to protect themselves from hazardous vapors? And what about the animals and livestock? What they are not disclosing is that those of us that live and work in this wonderful community will have to suffer the atrocities of listening to the huge turbine engines and wonder from day to day if our lives will be snuffed out by one mistake—the release of ammonia into the air, be it by land transportation or from the plant itself. The lives of these individuals will be forever silenced and leaving no hope for the future. The corporate executives do not and will not live here in Byron; they will not worry from day to day if their life will be suddenly terminated due to a faux pas. Less we forget, 3-Mile Island and Chernobyl, and they said it would never happen. This is not the area to place a plant of this magnitude.*

(General comments are noted. See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS for a discussion of the potential for ammonia leaks.)

**G&DK-2** a. *The County has designated this property “Prime Agriculture.” This plant does not conform to the County’s General Plan. Agriculture land is becoming so sparse because of projects like this. The choice has to be made – FOOD or ELECTRICITY – which is more important? I know we could survive without electricity.*

(See LAND USE.)

b. *This plant will also make the value of the surrounding property go down.*

(See SOCIOECONOMICS.)

- c. *Calpine has a lease/option on a piece of property adjoining the proposed site. Will they re-zone this property and make it industrial paving the way for more industry? Again—not what this area’s General Plan is designated for.*

(See LAND USE)

**G&DK-3** *Attending a previous meeting—the subject of noise was addressed. Calpine staff assured us that it would be “quiet as a library.” After visiting the Los Medanos Plant, we have to disagree. It was overwhelmingly loud, not to mention the ammonia smell, which took your breath away and burned your eyes.*

(See NOISE.)

**G&DK-4** *The 10 acres dedicated to two evaporation ponds are a big concern.*

- a. *Are we the only plant in California that has holding ponds, and why?*
- b. *Environmental issues are tremendous. How will you keep the wildlife and endangered species such as the Kit Fox, Red Legged Frog, Spotted Salamander, Swensen Hawk, Burrowing Owl, etc., from getting into these ponds and drinking this contaminated water? It seems that the monofilament will be a hindrance to animals that fly into it and get caught up in the line.*
- c. *Are the holding ponds going to have an odor that the residents and school children will be breathing constantly.*
- d. *Can we be reassured that our water will not be polluted?*

Response: the applicant amended the project proposal and no longer plans to use evaporation ponds. The applicant replaced the evaporation ponds with a brine crystallizer / dryer system per Supplement B to the AFC.

**G&DK-5** *Besides the plant itself being a visual eyesore, there is no landscaping on earth that would conceal the monstrosity of this plant. This is one more reason that this is not an appropriate placement of this plant. It would be visible from any direction for miles. How is it possible to place this project along designated scenic roads?*

(See VISUAL RESOURCES)

**G&DK-6** *The quoted approximate distance of Calpine’s primary route of 1.4 miles is in reality approximately 2 miles. Also, why are they stating that Kelso Road is their primary route, yet they are contracting easements from property owners from their second and third routes? Does Calpine have the right to Eminent Domain through private properties?*

Response: No, Calpine does not have the right of Eminent Domain. However, Calpine may enter into agreements for easements with property owners as they wish. Calpine may want to have easements for other linear routes as a backup plan.

**G&DK-7** *How brightly lit is a plant of this magnitude?*

(See VISUAL RESOURCES)

**G&DK-8** *Calpine has not committed to saying how many gallons of ammonia will be transported and are vague about how many times a week.*

(See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)

**G&DK-9** *School bus route is on both Kelso and Mountain house Road bordering the plant. Students will be exposed to high volume of pollution on a daily basis.*

(See AIR QUALITY)

**G&DK-10** *How close to the center of the earthquake fault is this area?*

(See GEOLOGY AND PALEONTOLOGY)

**G&DK-11** *Why is it we are the only site that has residents and schools less than a mile from the plant? We noted that there were only industrial sites round the plants in Pittsburg. No homes or schools. That is where the plants belong—in that kind of environment—not on Prime Agricultural Land.*

Response: The Energy Commission is not involved in the site selection process. Once an applicant selects a site and files an Application for Certification, it is the responsibility of Energy Commission staff to conduct an independent evaluation of the project.

**G&DK-12** *Why aren't plants such as Calpine put on Government land?*

Response: In the deregulated California electricity market, the majority of new power plants are built by private business owners, on private land.

**G&DK-13** *It was quoted in the Tri-Valley Herald that "California is facing a glut of electricity as a result of buying too much power through long-term contracts according to energy experts. The state even could find itself in the paradoxical position of encouraging Californians to use more electricity to help the state avoid selling large amounts of unused power at a loss." Another reason we do not need this plant.*

Response: In the deregulated market, the project owner takes the risk that there may at some point be an energy glut, which would drive down electricity prices and affect their bottom line. In other words, the project owner makes their own judgement about market demand.

**G&DK-14** *According to the Environmental Protection Agency – San Joaquin valley ranks just behind Los Angeles, Housing, and California's southeast desert, as the worst ozone regions in the nation. What consideration has been given to the impact on the air quality in San Joaquin county, (already in non-compliance) which would be directly affected by the proposed plant?*

(See AIR QUALITY)

**G&DK-15** *At Calpine meeting we were led to believe that the power would benefit the surrounding counties or at least California. Calpine being a merchant plant—the owners may sell the power from this merchant plant into the energy*

*system to any buyer willing to make a purchase. Rumors have it that this may be Nevada and Oregon. Why would Alameda County allow a plant to be built on Prime Agriculture Land when it possibly will not even benefit our State: And – how is it allowed on a scenic highway?*

Response: You are correct that Calpine, in operating a merchant plant, may sell electricity to any buyer they choose – in state or outside the state. Your concerns about the plant being built on Prime Agricultural land are addressed in LAND USE and your question about the scenic highway is addressed in VISUAL RESOURCES.

**G&DK-16** *Why not locate the plant on the far north side of the project site away from residents and school?*

(See response to G&DK-11)

**G&DK-17** *Why not aqua-ammonia instead of anhydrous ammonia? Accidents do happen (article faxed).*

(See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)

**G&DK-18** *I've visited other plants both under construction and partially running. The noise and commotion from all the construction going on and the noise from the plant in operation was not living up to the description that Calpine described as "quiet as a library"!*

(See NOISE)

**G&DK-19** *Calpine can debate all they want on what kind of tree or landscaping is going to do the best job – bottom line is – there is no tree or landscaping that can hide the enormous size of this plant. The Yuba Sutter plant we visited was not hidden – an indication of what our visual impact will be. Our visual quality will be diminished for life. Our view of Clifton Court Forebay will be gone. When all is done we will be the ones left to have to look at and hear the plant every single day of our lives.*

(See VISUAL RESOURCES)

**G&DK-20** *I would like to know if Calpine has addressed the Resolution R-01-406 from the Board of Supervisors of San Joaquin county? (faxed).*

Response: The Energy Commission received a copy of this Resolution and takes note of San Joaquin County's opposition to this power plant in Alameda County. Although the issues raised in the Resolution were general in nature, staff has tried to respond to these concerns within the staff analysis. The Resolution has been entered into the record for consideration by the Commissioners during the decision phase of our certification process.

**G&DK-21** *Has Calpine signed contracts with any facilities to purchase power?*

Response: Yes, Calpine has entered into a contract to sell power from this plant, if certified, to the State of California. Please refer to the PROJECT DESCRIPTION for more information about this contract.

**JACK D. AND DONNA HAYES**

**J&DH-1** *Mandatory routing of all ammonia shipments. Never past the school anytime day or night. Deliver from Byron Highway only.*

(See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)

**GORDON & MARIANNE GRIFFITH**

**G&MG-1** *I realize that this meeting is for the consideration of the East Altamont Energy Center (Calpine's) application, but I would like to just make a general statement as to our concerns.*

*We have been getting notices upon notices of the up-coming meetings and there have been many paper articles about the applications for new power plants in our area. To our north there is the plant on Kelso/Mt. House Road; to the northwest there is the Tesla Power Plant; to the east there is the power plant on Schulte Road; to the south, two of our neighbors have been talked to by companies about putting in power plants, and in Stockton there is discussion of another power plant. Now, existing 500 feet from our home is the Tesla substation (non-gas-powered). My husband and I moved from our ranch home to another site on our property so that we weren't being shocked by the results of the 500-kv line that is 500 feet or less from the house. We personally are being infested by these energy plants.*

*Although I realize that there is an added need for energy, I don't think that the plants should be located near populated areas. I believe that there are many unanswered questions that need to be addressed, as to the potential hazards of these plants. My concern is also that some of the people in Tracy are still unaware of these proposed plants and the effect that there may be on the community.*

Response: This document contains staff's independent assessment of the applicant's project as proposed, and includes a review of many potential impacts of the proposed facility. We encourage you to participate in the remainder of our process, and provide comments on staff's analysis of the project, for the benefit of the Commissioners in making their final decision.

**G&MG-2:** *I have many concerns about the Calpine or any other energy business, constructing and/or running a 1,100-MW natural gas-fired combined cycle power plant in our area.*

*I do commend Calpine for the community service and contributions to our Mt. House School and 4-H Club. It is a good gesture towards the*

*community, but at what cost to those who live in the direct area and surrounding areas?*

*(See response to G&MG-1)*

**G&MG-2:** *Mt. House School has only 50± students. We strive for the best education for our students. We don't have the 1,000 to 5,000 students that the cities have, but our students are no less important to us. My grandchildren attend Mt. House School, as I did. So, because we have a less number of students in our school, does this mean that if there was, God forbid, an "accident" or "leak," our students are sacrificed and not the hundreds or thousands at other sites? The death of our students and community doesn't mean as much?*

Response: Our analysis considers a school to be a "sensitive receptor" whether it has 2 students or 5,000 students. (See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)

**G&MG-3** *The safety of the gas pipeline to those in the immediate area is an issue to me also. We have been assured, by Calpine, that there isn't a danger to anyone in the area. There is always a potential danger when working in or around the pipeline area. The ammonia used at this plant is another issue. We are also assured that there is no fumes or smell coming from these plants. I have not been to a working plant, but understand from those who have been to one that the ammonia fumes are eye burning, to say the least, and the noise is unbearable.*

*(See HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)*

**G&MG-4** *I am not against progress or industry, but I believe that it should be located away (way away) from the communities where we live and our generations are growing up and being schooled. Our prime agriculture land is being taken over by industrial and housing developments, and malls.*

*We have and live in a very rural area. Sure, there are not hundreds or even thousands of human beings living in our area. We are an agriculture/rural area. Many of us have to work outside our homes to make a living, this is true, but our land and our farming is important to us. My land has been in our family for five generations. It is something that we have been very proud of. A part of our land we have only had for three generations. I have watched, as our land has been cut and surveyed and trespassed and easemented to death. We have been taken over in the name of "progress and need." Our property is only 40 percent useable, except for our dry-land farming or grazing. All in the name of "progress."*

*As the Commission is looking over these applications, please consider the people in the community who live, play, and educate in the immediate area of ANY of the energy centers. I believe that Calpine is a large company and has the ability to locate just about anywhere they wish. With the energy shortage and being threatened with blackout, we do need to look into alternative energy programs. I would only hope that Calpine, the new Tesla Power Project, and other gas-powered centers look somewhere where there isn't human life for miles and miles, and isn't a threat to rural communities.*

Response: This document contains staff's independent assessment of the applicant's project as proposed, and includes a review of site alternatives, land use impacts, and public health impacts, to name a few of the issues you mentioned. We encourage you to participate in our process and provide comments on staff's analysis of the project so that we may address your concerns in full.

**G&MG-5** *I also have a concern about the bright lighting that will be at night on the country roads. When the Muso Olive plant added lighting to their plant off of Schulte and Mt. House Parkway, if you were driving south on Mt. House Parkway, at times the driver was blinded by these (I believe they were described as Cal Trans Lights) lights. Many times I was blinded by these lights and couldn't see the road. This also added brightness from the Safeway and Costco plants. There must have been complaints to the plant as they were adjusted, and they are not as blinding as before although they are still bright. I think the distance was about a mile or so.*

(See VISUAL RESOURCES)

## **MRS. JANICE HOLLY-SHEEHAN**

**JHS-1** *My concern is that Calpine wants to build an 11k-megawatt electrical plant .9 of a mile from the school of Mountain House. I am concerned about an accident—there is no guarantee that an ammonia slip (no matter what the circumstances are that cause the slip) of ammonia or the quantity of released will never happen. I am not concerned with the health of the individuals in the surrounding area will be effected. I am not comfortable with Calpine's answer as how our safety will be assured and medical assistance received in a timely manner at our site. I am receiving the message from Calpine that since there is a smaller population in Byron over a city such as Livermore, Pleasanton, Oakland, the loss of 50 individuals is insignificant to the loss of a larger, more populated community. Calpine states they did not choose the site based on the local population, however, it is stated in the application (or description of the area). I believe this is one of their criteria to build the electrical plant in Byron not the location of their "hook-ups" to other facilities. The electrical plant is being constructed at the expense of the community—It is changing their environment, bringing noise pollution, air pollution, risk, effecting the land that was zoned agricultural and using it for industrial, changing the life of "Rural America". I understand that there are other issues surrounding soil, historical value of the city water, and that they also will be effected negatively if the plant is built in Byron. I do not want the 11k megawatt electrical plant built in Byron .9 miles from the school or near the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Gary Kuhn .4 miles from the plant. Keep industry where it belongs, not in the rural, agricultural area of Byron. Also, will there be verification test of the startup and shutdown emissions prior to the granting of the permit to operate?*

Response: Your comments and concerns are noted. Many of your concerns are addressed in this document (See AIR QUALITY, PUBLIC HEALTH, and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS). We encourage you to participate by providing additional public comment at the upcoming evidentiary hearings.



## **SHELDON G. MOORE**

**SM-1** *This Calpine project would have been great 50 years ago, prior to energy, security and ecology concerns. The East Altamont Energy Center is a simplistic approach to a complex problem. Today, this project is ill advised because we have more knowledge and experience in the areas of energy efficiency, ecology and recently are learning the importance of National Security.*

*A portion of our ranch was condemned 10 years ago under the pretext of separation of power transmission sources, for security reasons. With this East Altamont Energy Center plan, the reason for that condemnation is now bogus. The Calpine plan concentrates both generation and transmission of power to a very dangerous point. Sadly the reality of 911 will hang over this great nation for longer than we wish. We, as a nation, must operate our publicly used resources in a new way with maximum security being a top priority. The best plan today for both thermal efficiency and security is to disperse power plants. With the dispersal of power generation you can better use the thermal waste as you size the plant to local needs. There is no longer need for huge power transmission facilities. On site or close to site, gas fired generation can use the "waste," thermal energy to heat and cool structures. Energy is thus saved and a better environment is created.*

*Today, we must not repeat the mistakes of the past in the use of energy. Energy is a precious commodity and energy must be conserved. We do not need a quick but unwise fix today for our electrical problems. We must not waste tomorrow what we waste today.*

Response: The Energy Commission in fact has programs to promote research and development and address commercialization barriers for distributed generation, and programs to promote energy efficiency. However, the Energy Commission is also required to analyze power plant proposals on their face. We compare the project to other technologies in our alternatives analysis, but we cannot redefine the project or require the developer to change their project.

Staff has evaluated this project for impacts to the transmission system, the environment, and public health, and has determined that all such impacts can be mitigated except for those to visual resources.

Regarding your concern about security, please see HAZARDOUS MATERIALS for a discussion of new security-related conditions.

**SM-2** *The problem of noise pollution was not discussed. Since your meeting, I have discovered that Calpine has current noise pollution problems with smaller gas fired plants.*

Response: While your comments are not specific, the general topic of noise from the proposed facility was indeed analyzed and is presented in the NOISE AND VIBRATION section of this document.

**SM-3**     *The total sum of the pollution from this project is considerable and is still not precisely defined. The waste thermal energy is significant and will not be utilized to heat and cool homes or factories. Water use or waste is also great for the acres involved.*

*I asked Mr. D. Crespo, Community Outreach Coordinator for East Altamont Energy Center for just one positive effect this project would have on our ranch. There is no positive effect, only disaster. I have lived here for 40 years and our ranch is less than one mile from the site and directly down wind the majority of the year. I am not in favor of putting my mega-pollution on my neighbors and I do not want my neighbor to put their mega-pollution on me. This is the Golden Rule. I take a very dim view of inverse condemnation, which is what the pricing of an 1,100 Megawatt gas fired plan as planned would be.*

Response: Staff has not found any significant impacts to air quality that can't be mitigated. See staff's proposed conditions of certification in the AIR QUALITY section.

**SM-4**     *WAPA should reject this plan for security reasons. As a side issue, I feel it is urgent that WAPA improve security at their present switchyard. It appears to me that the 1994 switchyard upgrade completely ignored security required at that time. Today the ignored security must be addressed.*

Response: The proposed interconnection and the operation of Western's Tracy Substation are consistent with Western's current security requirements.

**SM-5**     *The Sierra Research documents appear to be junk data. Comments by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District tend to confirm my thought.*

*This proposed plant is just too big for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District because as you well know the Valley in effect is a closed basin.*

*It appears that the air current patterns in the project proposal area are not understood by the experts. Where is the wind data?  
(See AIR QUALITY)*

## **SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

---

The developers of East Altamont Energy Center have asked Western to interconnect the power plant with the agency's transmission system. Before Western can agree to the interconnection, it is bound by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to consider the project's environmental impacts. One of the first steps in the NEPA process is to ask the public to comment on the proposal, offer suggestions to improve the proposal, and even suggest alternative actions. The NEPA process of giving interested parties an opportunity to inform government agencies on environmental impacts is called "scoping."

An October, 2001 newsletter invited the public to a joint Energy Commission/Western scoping meeting in Livermore, California on November 14, 2001. The newsletter also served as Western's notification to prepare an environmental assessment (EA). A copy

of the newsletter can be found at <<http://www.wapa.gov/interconn/pdf/eastalt.pdf>>. The newsletter provided a description of the overall NEPA process, the location of the meeting, and a form on the back to send in comments. Most of the comments originated in this public scoping meeting, but some were received later. On January 7, 2002 the public scoping public comment period closed for the proposed EAEC.

This section summarizes the questions and comments that Western received and describes how Western and the Energy Commission are addressing the issues raised.

**Comment 1:** *What are the public health impacts from the ammonia that is being used by EAEC and will there be odor down wind from the ammonia?*

**Response:** Approaches and procedures for handling ammonia are discussed in the Hazardous Materials section. Similar questions have been raised with Energy Commission staff. These comments and their responses can be found in the Response to Public and Agency Comments section at the following references: G&DK-1, G&DK-8, G&DK-17, G&MC-3, J&DH-1, and JHS-1. Responses can also be found in the Hazardous Materials section in the Response to Public and Agency Comments subsection.

**Comment 2:** *Three related comments include the following:*

*Why has the applicant pursued easements on two different routes for the gas pipeline?*

*Why have options been purchased to the south of the project site for the gas pipeline?*

*Have easements been acquired for running a gas pipeline parallel to the canal and transmission lines?*

**Response:** A discussion of easements and routes for linear infrastructure, such as pipelines, can be found in the Biological Resources section in the Impacts from Linear Facilities subsection. Similar questions have been raised with Energy Commission staff. These comments and their responses can be found in the Response to Public and Agency Comments section at the following references: G&DK-6, and G&MG-3.

**Comment 3:** *In the photo provided by the applicant in the AFC, the stacks appear to be out of scale with the proposed landscape. A second comment asked the question, "Why did the applicant not provide more aerial photos showing the project site from other perspectives? The photos make the surrounding area look more rural than it truly is."*

**Response:** During the scoping meeting the project applicant indicated the stacks would be 175 feet tall as proposed. Additional information can be found in the Visual Resources Section.

**Comment 4:** *What kind of trees will be used in the landscaping around the power plant? How long will it take for the trees to mature to their maximum height? Will the trees cover the towers?*

**Response:** Similar questions have been raised with Energy Commission staff. These comments and their responses can be found in the Response to Public and Agency Comments section at the referenced comment, G&DK-19. Information about landscaping can be found in both the Visual Resources and the Biological Resources sections.

**Comment 5:** *How long will it take for the plant to be built?*

**Response:** The applicant plans to begin construction in 2003 and complete construction in 2005.

**Comment 6:** *Two comments related to distributed generation were raised. The first asked, why not size the plant to service the local community and avoid transmission line construction? The second asked, would not distributed generation serve a better purpose than the construction of a single large power plant?*

**Response:** Energy Commission and Western staff investigated distributed generation in the Alternatives Section, Alternatives Eliminated From This Analysis subsection. The Energy Commission concluded the following: “distributed energy is not a feasible alternative to the proposed project because of technical, institutional, and regulatory barriers.” In this same section, Western has concluded that distributed energy generation is not consistent with Western’s purpose and need to provide non-discriminatory open transmission line access.

**Comment 7:** *Is the plant a possible target for terrorist activity?*

**Response:** All private and public infrastructure is a possible target for terrorist activity. Potentially catastrophic accidents (which may be similar to terrorist events) are analyzed in the Hazardous Materials Management Section. In this section both the gas pipeline and ammonia tanks and procedures are evaluated. An emergency action plan and a fire prevention plan are required, as stated in the Worker Safety and Fire Protection Section.

**Comment 8:** *Is Western upgrading the power lines from west of Sacramento to Tracy? Is this upgrade related to the EAEC? Is the upgrade needed for the EAEC?*

**Response:** Western has proposed an upgrade of the existing transmission system. The proposed upgrades will be addressed in a separate environmental impact statement, currently scheduled for release in the fall of 2002. The need for the upgrade is independent and distinct from the proposed EAEC application for interconnection.

**Comment 9:** *Why does Western’s cheap power go to preferred customers only?*

**Response:** Western’s power allocations and rate setting procedures are established by Federal law and regulation.

**Comment 10:** *A member of the public voiced support for the proposed plant due to its proximity to support facilities and the state’s need for power.*

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment 11:** *Could the power from the EAEC be sold out of state?*

**Response:** A similar question was raised with Energy Commission staff. This comment and the response can be found in the Response to Public and Agency Comments section at the referenced comment, G&DK-21.

**Comment 12:** *Will the Modesto Irrigation District's transmission line into the Tracy substation be upgraded? What is the final position of the transmission lines coming from the EAEC that tie into the existing transmission lines? Is the final location of the lines the same as has always been proposed?*

**Response:** The Tracy-Westley 230-kV transmission line would not be upgraded as part of the proposed EAEC project. The Tracy and Westley substations would be upgraded to accommodate the proposed interconnection. See the Transmission System Engineering Section for more information.

**Comment 13:** *Will the upgraded lines or the increased power from the EAEC increase electromagnetic fields? Could a house 400 feet away from the power lines have increased electromagnetic fields?*

**Response:** Electromagnetic fields are analyzed in the Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance Section.

**Comment 14:** *How much construction traffic will there be on the Mountain House and Kelso Road? What noise level will exist?*

**Response:** Traffic impacts are analyzed in the Traffic and Transportation Section. Noise impacts are assessed in the Noise and Vibration Section. Similar questions have been raised with Energy Commission staff. These comments and their responses can be found in the Response to Public and Agency Comments section at the following referenced comments, G&DK-3, G&DK-18.

**Comment 15:** *Can the EAEC be moved to the north on the existing parcel?*

**Response:** The project applicant responded that the plant couldn't be moved north because of restrictions limiting proximity to designated scenic routes. The Alternatives section includes an analysis of analyzed alternative sites for the proposed power plant.

## AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED

AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAITON
Air Quality	Oversight of permit issuance, enforcement	Gerardo Rios	Chief, Permits Office USEPA Region IX
Air Quality	Regulatory oversight	Mike Tollstrup	Chief , Project Assessment Branch California Air Resources Board
Air Quality	Permit issuance, enforcement	William deBoisblanc	Director of Permit Services Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Biological & Water Resources	Potential impacts to endangered species in the Delta	Jeffrey Stuart	National Marine Fisheries Service
Biological Resources	Encroachment Permits	Bob Hendry	Contra Costa County Planning Dept.
Biological Resources	California threatened or endanger species	Janis Gann Dan Gifford	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Biological Resources	Encroachment Permits	Jeff Fischer	San Joaquin Planning Dept.
Biological Resources	Encroachment Permits	John Rogers	County of Alameda Public Works Agency
Biological Resources	Streambed Alteration Agreement	Joseph Powell	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Biological Resources	Waters of the U.S. and wetland impacts	Nancy Haley	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Biological Resources	Federal threatened or endangered species	Sheila Larsen Mike Nepstad	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Biological Resources	Delta Fish	William E. Hearn	U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service
Cultural Resources	Federal agency NHPA Section 106 compliance	Daniel Abeyta Knox Mellon	California Office of Historic Preservation
Cultural Resources	Native American traditional cultural properties	Debbie Pilas-Treadway, NAHC	Associate Government Program Analysis
Cultural Resources	EAEC Cultural	Larry Myers	Native American Heritage Commission
Cultural Resources	EAEC Cultural	Lisa Asche	Alameda County Planning Dept.
Cultural Resources	EAEC Cultural	Robert O. Ueltzen	State Parks & Recreation
Fire Protection	Fire service coverage	James Ferdinand	Fire Marshal, Alameda County Fire Dept.
General	San Joaquin County's opposition to the EAEC	Lynn Bedford	Supervisor San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
General	San Joaquin County's opposition to the EAEC	Phil Brown	San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
Geologic Hazards and Resources	EAEC Geologic Hazards and Resources	Andy Cho	County Geologist, Alameda County
Geologic Hazards and Resources	EAEC Geologic Hazards and Resources	Jim Davis	State Geologist, California Division of Mines and Geology
Geologic Hazards and Resources	EAEC Geologic Hazards and Resources	Mark R. Bardley	Sr. Engineer Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAITON
Hazardous Materials	Fire Dept. Permits	Bob Bowman	Deputy Fire Marshal, Alameda County Fire Dept.
Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Response	Jody Naff, Stan Silva or Vince Davis (depending on shift)	Battalion Chief, Alameda County Fire Dept., Haz Mat Support Unit
Hazardous Materials	Sensitive Receptors within a 3-mile Radius of the EAEC Site	Mountain House School District	3950 Mountain House Road
Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Business Plan & Risk Management Plan	Rob Weston	Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist, Alameda County Environmental Health Dept.
Land Use Visual Resources		Adolph Martinelli	Agency Director, Alameda County Community Development Agency
Land Use	Contra Costa County Encroachment Permit	Bob Hendry	Public Works Permitting Engineer Contra Costa County, Permit Assistance Center
Land Use	Alameda County East County Area Plan (1994)  "Measure D"  Alameda County Zoning Ordinance (2000)	Bruce Jensen	Senior Planner Alameda County Community Development Agency, Planning Dept.
Land Use Traffic & Transp.		Bruce Jensen	Planner, Alameda County Community Development Agency
Land Use	Miscellaneous land use issues	Chandler Martin	San Joaquin County Planning Dept.
Land Use	Requirement to have a General Plan	Darren Ranelletti	Planner, Alameda County Community Development Agency
Land Use		James Sorensen	Planning Director, Alameda County Community Development Agency
Land Use	San Joaquin County General Plan (1992)  San Joaquin County Zoning Ordinance (2000)	Jeff Fischer  Michael Hitchcock	Planner San Joaquin County Planning Dept. Planner, Mountain House Project
Land Use	Delta Protection Commission	Jim Van Buren Roberta Goulard	Sr. Planner for Delta Protection Act guidance in General Plan Sr. Planner for Delta Protection Act guidance in General Plan
Land Use	Alameda County Encroachment Permit	John Rogers	Alameda County Public Works Agency, Development Services
Land Use	Contra Costa County General Plan (1996)  Contra Costa County Zoning Ordinance (2000)	Patrick Roache	Senior Planner Contra Costa County Planning Dept.
Land Use	Miscellaneous land use issues	Paul Stenz	City of Livermore
Land Use	San Joaquin County Encroachment Permit	Reed Campbell	Public Works Permitting Engineer San Joaquin County, Public Works Dept.

AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAION
Land Use	Miscellaneous land use issues	Vicki Lombardo	City of Tracy
Land Use & Soils	Prime farmland mapping	David Patch	Associate Environmental Planner, California Dept. of Conservation
Noise		Bob Hendry	Contra Costa County
Noise	EAEC Noise	Darin Ranalletti	Alameda County
Noise		Jeff Fischer	San Joaquin County
Public Health	Public exposure to acutely hazardous materials	Brian Bateman	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Public Health	Public exposure to toxic air contaminants	Brian Bateman	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Public Health	Public exposure to chemicals known to cause cancer of reproductive toxicity (Health & Safety Code 25249.5 et seq. (Safe Drinking Water & Toxic Enforcement Act of 186-Proposition 65)	Cynthia Oshita or Susan Long	Office of Environment Health & Hazard Assessment
Public Health	Public exposure to air pollutants (Clean Air Act)	David Howekamp	USEPA
Public Health	Public exposure to acutely hazardous materials (40 CFR Part 68 (Risk Management Plan)	David Howekamp Rob Weston	USEPA Region IX Alameda County Environmental Management
Public Health	Public exposure to toxic air contaminants	Ray Menebroker	California Air Resources Board
Public Health	Public exposure to acutely hazardous materials	Rob Weston	Alameda County Environmental Management
Public Health		Ronald Torres, R.E.H.S.	Supervising Environmental Health Specialist, Alameda County Health Agency
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Allan Arjo	Director of Business Advisory Services Alameda County Office of Education
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Barbara Claussen	Secretary to Principal West (Merril F.) High School
Socioeconomics	Labor Union Contacts	Barry Luboviski	Alameda Building Trades Council
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Bryan Masterson	Alameda County Sheriff's Dept.
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Chandler Martin	San Joaquin County Planning Dept.
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Charles Farrughia Bill Gaudinier	Administrative Lieutenant Acting Adm. Lieutenant Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Christine Fitzpatrick	Secretary to Director of Curriculum/Student Services Tracy Unified School District
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Dolores Kuhn	Secretary, Mountain House Elementary School District
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Dolores Ohm	Facilities Technician Tracy Unified School District



AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAITON
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Elizabeth Evans	Chief of Appraisal Division Tax Manager Alameda County Office of the Assessor
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Esther Lai Janet Allen Melanie Darling	California State Board of Equalization
Socioeconomics	Labor Union Contacts	Greg Feere	Contra Costa Building Trades Council
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Jody Maas Bob Bowman Stanley Silva James Ferdinand	Battalion Chief Deputy Fire Marshall Battalion Chief, Battalion 2 Fire Marshall Alameda County Fire Dept.
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Mike Lime	Assistant Manager, Emergency Room San Joaquin County Hospital
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Ron Ray	Tracy Police Dept.
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Sandra Hern	Office of Tax Manager, Alameda County
Socioeconomics	EAEC Socioeconomics	Tom Lum	Tax Manager, Alameda County Auditor Controller-Agency
Soils	Grading and trenching	Bob Hendry	Engineer, Contra Costa County Public Works
Soils	Grading and trenching	Gary Moore	Grading Supervisor, Alameda County Grading Dept.
Soils	Soil erosion	Leo Sarmiento	Water Quality Engineer, Regional Water Quality Control Board
Soils	Grading Permit	Rick Coates	Deputy Director, San Joaquin County Community Development
Traffic & Transportation	Transport oversized or excessive loads over State highways	Harold Burnett (Single Trip) Dee Garcia (Annual)	Caltrans
Traffic & Transportation		Karen Bormann	Alameda County Dept. of Public Works
Traffic & Transportation	Transport hazardous materials on Interstate highways  Shipping of inhalation or explosive materials	Sgt. Deborah Pierce	California Highway Patrol
Transmission System Engineering		Gil Butler	Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Transmission System Engineering		Gregory Salyer	Modesto Irrigation District
Transmission System Engineering		Steven Ng	Pacific Gas & Electric
Tribal Contacts		Andrew Galvan	The Ohlone Indian Tribe Mission San Jose, CA
Tribal Contacts		Ann Marie Sayer	Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan Hollister, CA
Tribal Contacts		Ella Rodriguez	
Tribal Contacts		Irene Zwielerlein	Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band Woodside, CA
Tribal Contacts		Jakki Kehl	

AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAION
Tribal Contacts		Katherine Erolinda Perez	
Tribal Contacts		Marjorie Ann Ried	
Tribal Contacts		Michelle Zimmer	Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band San Jose, CA
Tribal Contacts		Ramona Garibay	Trina Marine Ruano Family Fremont, CA
Tribal Contacts		Thomas Soto	
Visual Resources	Alameda County East County Area Plan  Alameda County Scenic Route Element of the General Plan  Alameda County Zoning Ordinance	Chris Bazar	Assistant Planning Director Alameda County Planning Dept.
Waste Management	Solid Waste	Karen Moroz	Senior Registered Environmental Health Specialist, Alameda County, Environmental Health Dept.
Waste Management	Nonhazardous Waste Solid Waste Planning, Source Reduction & Recycling	Lois Clarke	Program Manager, Alameda County Waste Management Authority
Waste Management	Hazardous Waste Hazardous	Rob Weston	Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist, Alameda County, Environmental Health Dept.
Water Resources	Water rights issues	Andrew Sawyer	Assistant Chief Counsel State Water Resources Control Board
Water Resources	Sewer / Storm Drainage and Flood Control	Bruce Jensen	Alameda County Senior Planner
Water Resources	Potential impacts of fresh water supply on the State Water Project and Delta	Dan Flory Nancy Quan Maureen Sergent	California Dept. of Water Resources
Water Resources	County Grading Permit	Gary Moore	Grading Supervisor, Alameda County Grading Dept.
Water Resources	Construction Activity NPDES Stormwater Permit	Leo Samiento	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Water Resources	Wetlands Permit a404 (and Water Quality Certification, Section 401)	Nancy Haley	US Army Corps of Engineers
Water Resources	Industrial Wastewater Discharge Requirements (WDR) Title 27	Patricia Leary	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Water Resources	Recycled water supply	Paul Sensibaugh	General Manager Mountain House Community Service District
Water Resources	Title 22 of the CAC (State) BBID Agreement to Serve	Rick Gilmore	General Manager Byron Bethany Irrigation District
Water Resources	County Stormwater Requirements	Robert Hale	Alameda County

AREA	ISSUE	CONTACT	ORGANIZAITON
Water Resources	Recycled water supply	Steven Bayley	Deputy Director City of Tracy Dept. of Public Works
Water Resources	General Industrial NPDES Stormwater Permit	Sue O'Connell	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Water Resources	Title 27, Waste Discharge Requirements (State)	Victor Izzo	Senior Water Quality Engineer Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Water Resources	Recycled water supply	Virgle Koehne	General Manager Discovery Bay Community Services District
Water Resources	Streambed Alteration Agreement 1601	Warden Joe Powell	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Worker Health and Safety	EAEC Worker Health and Safety	Duty Officer	Duty Officer, Office of Emergency Services--Alameda County
Worker Health and Safety	EAEC Worker Health and Safety	Robert Weston or Ariu Levi	Hazardous Materials Specialist (notify in the event of a spill or hazardous materials release)